

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

KHOR CHIN LIM,
Plaintiff,

v.

NEW YORK STATE BOARD OF LAW
EXAMINERS, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 25-cv-02661-EMC

**ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND
RECOMMENDATION; AND
DISMISSING CASE**

Docket No. 15

Plaintiff is a pro se litigant. Previously, Magistrate Judge Ryu granted his application to proceed in forma pauperis (“IFP”) but dismissed his complaint pursuant to a review under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e). She noted, *inter alia*, that “Plaintiff’s claims of bribery and racketeering are based only on conclusory statements, naked assertions without any factual basis, and allegations that are not plausible on their face.” Docket No. 8 (Order at 3). She further noted that “Plaintiff does not appear to allege any claims related to his 2025 Wisconsin criminal matters” but indicated that, even if he had, “the *Younger* abstention doctrine would prohibit any claim that Plaintiff may raise about his pending criminal proceedings” and “personal jurisdiction over any of the individuals or entities involved in [the] Wisconsin criminal proceedings” also appeared lacking. Docket No. 8 (Order at 3). Judge Ryu allowed Plaintiff to amend his complaint by June 2, 2025, and warned that she would recommend a dismissal of his case if he did not timely amend. *See* Docket No. 8 (Order at 4).

Plaintiff did not timely amend. Judge Ryu therefore issued a report and recommendation (“R&R”) in which she recommended that Plaintiff’s case be dismissed without prejudice for failure to prosecute. *See* Docket No. 15 (R&R at 1).

Plaintiff has not objected to the R&R, in spite of having been served with a copy.¹ The Court has also reviewed the R&R and all other evidence of record and finds the R&R thorough, well reasoned, and correct. Accordingly, the Court hereby **ADOPTS** the R&R in its entirety and **DISMISSES** Plaintiff's case without prejudice based on failure to prosecute.

The Clerk of the Court is instructed to enter a final judgment in accordance with this order and close the file in the case.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: June 24, 2025



EDWARD K. CHEN
United States District Judge

¹ As Judge Ryu has noted, Plaintiff is an e-filer, and both the R&R (Docket No. 15) and Judge Ryu's prior order (Docket No. 8) were served at the email address he provided (kc53546@hotmail.com). The Court acknowledges that this email address is different from the one he listed on his complaint (kclim478@aol.com). But the record indicates that Plaintiff has been getting filings in this case through the Hotmail account – *e.g.*, shortly after Judge Ryu granted the IFP application (Docket No. 8), Plaintiff filed a motion asking that the U.S. Marshals Office be ordered to serve the complaint since his IFP application had been approved (Docket No. 10). Also, shortly after the Clerk's Office issued a notice to Plaintiff asking whether he consented to proceeding before a magistrate judge (Docket No. 12), he filed a declination (Docket No. 14).

The Court also notes that Plaintiff has received filings and been able to make filings even though he represents that he is an inmate in a County Jail located in Toledo, Iowa. *But see* Docket No. 17 (mail to County Jail address returned as undeliverable).